



SCOP

NEWSLETTER

Volume 2, Number 2

Missouri State Committee of Psychologists

March 1986

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Rose Boyarsky, Ph.D.
St. Louis
Chairperson

Sara Ann Duncan
Kansas City
Secretary and Public Member

Larry J. Bass, Ph.D.
Springfield
Member

Roy C. Davis, D.Mn.
Kansas City
Member

David Edens, Ed.D.
Columbia
Member

Kenneth Russ, Ph.D.
St. Louis
Member

SCOP Newsletter Editor
Rose Boyarsky, Ph.D.

CENTRAL OFFICE
Administrative Aide

Sue Wilson
Post Office Box 4
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

314-751-2334

Guidelines for Computer Based Assessment and Interpretation Adopted March, 1985 by the American Association of State Psychology Boards Executive Committee

Special expertise in developing and using standardized tests and measurement procedures has been a distinguishing feature of the profession of psychology that has set it apart from other mental health specialty areas. Motivated by a desire to increasingly standardize psychometric practices, psychologists were among the first to explore the application of computers to the administration, scoring, and interpretation of tests. Early developers of such approaches were limited to the few who had access to main frame computers. In 1966, in recognition of increasing activity in the area, the American Psychological Association adopted interim standards on "Automated Test Scoring and Interpretation Practices" (APA, 1966).

The advent of microcomputers in the early 1980's profoundly altered potential uses and abuses of computerized testing approaches as both equipment and relevant software became available to institutional and individual users at dramatically reduced costs. Increasing concern has been voiced by licensing/certification jurisdictions over appropriate professional and ethical use of such services. In an informal survey conducted at the 1984 annual meeting of the AASPB, 20 of the 32 participating boards indicated that issues had already arisen in their jurisdictions concerning the use of such services. Almost all of the specific issues that were identified involved either inappropriate use of such services or use by potentially unqualified personnel. Few boards had taken any direct action, and no jurisdictions indicated they had as yet developed local standards outlining acceptable practice in the development and use of such services. All jurisdictions anticipated the necessity of acting on such issues sometime in the near future. (A summary of this informal survey is available from the AASPB central office.)

In 1983 the American Psychological Association directed its Committee on Professional Standards (COPS) and Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment (CPTA) to draft guidelines for computer based assessment and interpretation that could eventually be adopted by the APA as policy. A first draft of the guidelines has been prepared and is currently undergoing review and revision. It is anticipated this document will eventually provide licensing/certification jurisdictions with a detailed statement that may be used in refining local regulations.

After considerable review and discussion, the AASPB Executive Committee has endorsed the Guidelines for Computer Based Assessment and Interpretation that follow. Individual jurisdictions are invited to use these Guidelines in defining acceptable standards of practice for licensed/certified psychologists involved in the

development, dissemination, and/or use of computer based assessment and interpretation procedures. While it is acknowledged that the authority of psychology credentialing boards extends primarily to licensed/certified psychologists, *other mental health professionals and social scientists using computerized testing services are strongly encouraged to do so in a fashion congruent with the guidelines.* Psychologists involved in the development and dissemination of such materials are reminded of their responsibility to make them available only to qualified personnel as defined in the principles that follow:

1. Licensed/certified psychologists are expected to conduct their practice congruent with accepted standards of ethical practice in the United States and in Canada and as established by the various state and provincial licensing jurisdictions. *Psychologists involved in the development, dissemination, and/or use of computer based assessment and interpretation procedures are responsible for adhering to relevant ethical principles. Sections of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* of the American Psychological Association (1981) of special significance to psychologists using or developing computer based assessment and interpretation procedures are listed in Appendix A.*
2. Licensed/certified psychologists who develop, disseminate, and/or use computer based assessment and interpretation procedures are responsible for supporting and implementing testing standards as represented in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests* (APA, 1974) and in future revisions of this document.
3. Individual and institutional developers of computer software programs for use in administering, scoring, and interpreting educational and psychological tests will include in their employ professional personnel with necessary education and training in psychometric theory, test construction, and use and interpretation of relevant tests. It is anticipated that in most instances such personnel will be licensed psychologists whose backgrounds include the qualifications enumerated above.
4. *Individual and institutional users (as distinguished from test takers) of computer based assessment and interpretation services will include in their employ professional personnel with appropriate education and training in psychometric theory and in the use and interpretation of relevant tests. Such personnel may be, but are not necessarily limited to, licensed psychologists.*
5. Computer generated interpretive test reports are to be used only in conjunction with professional judgment. It is generally presumed there will be personal contact and direct communication between professional user and test taker. Specific characteristics of the test taker, as well as the context within which the testing occurred, must be taken into account by the professional user in any resulting decision making or advising to test takers. Psychologists who use computer generated interpretive statements in preparing psychological evaluations will acknowledge the sources of such statements in a written citation that is formally included in the client report. Material taken verbatim from such computer generated interpretations will be formally quoted using an appropriate format.
6. Special care must be exercised when using computer generated interpretive test reports for purposes of personality assessment. In addition to training in psychometric theory, professionals who use such computer based interpretive reports must be educated and trained in areas such as personality theory, individual psychopathology, and use and interpretation of personality assessment procedures. It is assumed that users of such services will be licensed psychologists with relevant training in the areas noted or mental health professionals with comparable training and experience.
7. Developers of computer based assessment and interpretation services are responsible for providing professional users of such services with descriptions of specific scales on which interpretive statements are based as well as the test takers scores on the relevant scales. Developers are also responsible for providing users with accurate information concerning whether interpretive reports are based on quantitative research and/or expert professional judgment. Interpretive reports based on quantitative research should include expectancy tables or similar summarizations of predictive data. Interpretive reports based on expert professional judgment should include acknowledgements of experts' names, credentials, and sources of additional information.
8. Developers of computer based assessment and interpretation services are responsible for clearly describing reliability and validity characteristics of testing instruments and assessment procedures that are made available to professional users. *Experimental approaches must be identified as such. Included in this responsibility are such issues as equivalence or nonequivalence of computer scale vs. conventional scale scores and the reliability and validity of computerized versions of conventionally developed tests.*
9. Professional personnel who use computers to administer tests must insure that standardized testing conditions are implemented. Necessary precautions must be taken to insure that microcomputers and related equipment do not introduce extraneous sources of error into the testing situation.
10. *Both developers and professional users of computer based assessment and interpretation services must take adequate precautions to insure that the privacy and confidentiality rights of test takers are maintained.*

APPENDIX A

Ethical Principles of Special Significance for Computer Based Assessment and Interpretation

Principle 1 — RESPONSIBILITY

In providing services, psychologists maintain the highest standards of their profession. They accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts and make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately.

Principle 2 — COMPETENCE

... Psychologists recognize the boundaries of their competence and the limitations of their techniques. They only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

... They maintain knowledge of current scientific and professional information related to the services they render.

e. Psychologists responsible for decisions involving individuals or policies based on test results have an understanding of psychological or educational measurement, validation problems, and test research.

Principle 4 — PUBLIC STATEMENTS

Public statements, announcements of services, advertising, and promotional activities of psychologists serve the purpose of helping the public make informed judgments and choices. Psychologists represent accurately and objectively their professional qualifications, affiliations, and functions, as well as those of the institutions or organizations with which they or the statements may be associated. In public statements providing psychological information or professional opinions or providing information about the availability of psychological products, publications, and services, psychologists base their statements on scientifically acceptable psychological findings and techniques with full recognition of the limits and uncertainties of such evidence.

b. ... Public statements include, but are not limited to, communication by means of periodical, book, list, directory, television, radio, or motion picture. They do not contain (i) a false, fraudulent, misleading, deceptive, or unfair statement; (ii) a misinterpretation of fact or a statement likely to mislead or deceive because in context it makes only a partial disclosure of relevant facts; (iii) a testimonial from a patient regarding the quality of a psychologists' services or products; (iv) a statement intended or likely to create false or unjustified expectations of favorable results; (v) a statement implying unusual, unique, or one-of-a-kind abilities; (vi) a statement intended or likely to appeal to a client's fears, anxieties or emotions concerning the possible results of failure to obtain the offered services (vii) a statement concerning the comparative desirability of offered services; (viii) a statement of direct solicitation of individual clients.

e. Psychologists associated with the development or promotion of psychological devices, books, or other products offered for commercial sale make reasonable efforts to ensure that announcements and advertisements are presented in a professional, scientifically acceptable, and factually informative manner.

g. Psychologists present the science of psychology and offer their services, products, and publications fairly and accurately, avoiding misrepresentation through sensationalism, exaggeration, or superficiality. Psychologists are guided by the primary obligation to aid the public in developing informed judgments, opinions, and choices.

j. A psychologist accepts the obligation to correct others who represent the psychologist's professional qualifications, or associations with products or services, in a manner incompatible with these guidelines.

k. Individual diagnostic and therapeutic services are provided only in the context of a professional psychological relationship. When personal advice is given by means of public lectures or demonstrations, newspaper or magazine articles, radio or television programs, mail, or similar media, the psychologist utilizes the most current relevant data and exercises the highest level of professional judgment.

Principle 8 — ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES

In the development, publication, and utilization of psychological assessment techniques, psychologists make every effort to promote the welfare and best interests of the client. They guard against the misuse of assessment results. They respect the client's right to know the results, the interpretations made, and the bases for their conclusions and recommendations. Psychologists make every effort to maintain the security of tests and other assessment techniques within limits of legal mandates. They strive to ensure the appropriate use of assessment techniques by others.

a. In using assessment techniques, psychologists respect the right of clients to have full explanations of the nature and purpose of the techniques in language the clients can understand, unless an explicit exception to this right has been agreed upon in advance. When the explanations are to be provided by others, psychologists establish procedures for ensuring the adequacy of these explanations.

b. Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards.

c. In reporting assessment results, psychologists indicate any reservations that exist regarding validity or reliability because of the circumstances of the assessment or the inappropriateness of the norms for the person tested. Psychologists strive to ensure that the results of assessments and their interpretations are not misused by others.

d. Psychologists recognize that assessment results may become obsolete. They make every effort to avoid and prevent the misuse of obsolete measures.

e. Psychologists offering scoring and interpretation services are able to produce appropriate evidence for the validity of the programs and procedures used in arriving at interpretations. The public offering of an automated interpretation service is considered a professional-to-professional consultation. Psychologists make every effort to avoid misuse of assessment reports.

f. Psychologists do not encourage or promote the use of psychological assessment techniques by inappropriately trained or otherwise unqualified persons through teaching, sponsorship, or supervision.

References

American Psychological Association (1981). Ethical principles of psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 36, 633-638.

American Psychological Association (1966). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 21, 1141.

American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Association, National Council on Measurement in Education (1974). *Standards for educational and psychological tests*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Request for Feedback!

The State Committee of Psychologists, in its constant efforts to stay abreast of new issues and problems pertinent to psychology in Missouri, is studying the Guidelines for Computer Based Assessment and Interpretation adopted by the American Association of State Psychology Boards in March 1985. SCOP is requesting comments and feedback from Missouri licensed psychologists about these guidelines. Should Missouri adopt them as part of the licensure law? Are there changes Missouri Psychologists feel should be made if they are adopted?

Please send your feedback to SCOP, Post Office Box 4, Jefferson City, MO 65102, by June 15, 1986.

INTRODUCING . . .

Two new board members have recently been appointed to serve on the State Committee of Psychologists. They are —

ROY C. DAVIS, D.Mn., age 41, currently resides in Kansas City, MO.

DAVID EDENS, Ed.D., age 60, currently resides in Columbia, MO.

Dr. Davis and Dr. Edens are replacing Dr. A. Samuel Oliveri and Dr. Paul T. King whose terms have expired.

EPPP: — The Licensing Examination

The State of Missouri uses the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) prepared by the Professional Examination Service of New York. Drafts of the exam are reviewed by the Examination and Executive Committee of the American Association of State Psychology Boards. Member Boards, of which Missouri is one, are also able to review the exam drafts.

The examination was first given in 1965 when 7 states and the District of Columbia used the exam to examine a total of 27 psychologists. Use of the EPPP Exam has increased over the years so that now all states, (except Michigan), the District of Columbia and 7 Canadian Provinces use the examination.

Missouri passed a license law in 1977 and used the EPPP for the first time in October 1979 when 57 candidates took the examination.

For your information, curiosity and just plain perusing, the following is the year by year data for Missouri:

Examination Data

Exam Date	Total Taking Exam	Total Passing Exam	Total Failing Exam	Doctoral Level Passing	Doctoral Level Failing	Nat'l Mean Score	High Raw Score	Low Raw Score
10/19/79	57	27	30	24	12	149	178	81
04/11/80	38	25	13	19	5	139	178	78
10/10/80	43	18	25	15	13	153	179	79
04/10/81	53	37	16	23	8	133	171	72
10/16/81	48	24	24	17	11	135	167	88
04/16/82	76	44	32	28	11	137	176	90
10/08/82	54	25	29	18	10	142	176	78
04/8/83	50	25	25	17	10	143	173	74
10/14/83	42	26	16	18	7	151	182	106
04/13/84	38	26	12	21	2	141	168	102
10/26/84	24	16	8	8	4	147	173	105
04/19/85	33	22	11	17	5	138	174	114
10/11/85	34	28	6	20	3	136	174	109
Totals	590	343 (58.1%)	247	245 (70.8%)	101 (29.1%)	(For Missouri Examinees)		

Total Licensed Psychologists: 1380

Licensed by Grandfathering: 864

Licensed by Examination: 343

Licensed by Reciprocity: 173

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE STATE COMMITTEE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS

The role of the State Committee of Psychologists in the discipline of licensed psychologists is set forth in Section 337.035, RSMo Supp. 1984. The reasons for which a license may be disciplined under this section are varied, as are the issues and problems that come before the Committee.

Usually problems with professional psychologists that come within the purview of Section 337.035, RSMo Supp. 1984, are brought to the attention of the State Committee of Psychologists by one of three routes:

1. complaints by patients;
2. complaints by other practicing professionals; or
3. notification of discipline from another jurisdiction.

Patient complaints concerning licensed psychologists in the state of Missouri almost always involve charges of ethical violations. Section 337.035.2(15), RSMo Supp. 1984, specifically makes unethical conduct, as defined and set forth in 4 CSR 235-5.020, cause for disciplinary action. Such complaints often involve the dual allegations that the psychologist has both acted unethically towards the patient by engaging in or attempting to engage in some act or practice that is either beyond the psychologist's competence or beyond the bounds of legitimate psychologist/patient relations, and that such action by the psychologist constitutes a violation of the trust imposed in the psychologist by the patient (Section 337.035.2(13), RSMo Supp. 1984). This then leads to the concomitant allegation that the psychologist has likewise engaged in either misconduct, incompetency, or some other form of dishonesty (Section 337.035.2(5), RSMo Supp. 1984).

Complaints arising from other psychologists generally stem from the complaining psychologist's recognition of his or her duty to aid in protecting the public and helping to maintain the standards of professionalism incumbent upon all psychologists. This duty is codified in 4 CSR 235-5.020(8) (G) which states:

"When psychologists know of an ethical violation by another psychologist, and it seems appropriate, they informally attempt to resolve the issue by bring the behavior to the attention of the psychologist. If the misconduct is of a minor nature and/or appears to be due to lack of sensitivity, knowledge, or experience, such an informal solution is usually appropriate. Such informal corrective efforts are made with sensitivity to any rights to confidentiality involved. If the violation does not seem amendable to an informal solution, or is of a more serious nature, psychologists bring it to the attention of the appropriate local, state, and/or national committee on professional ethics and conduct."

Impaired psychologists, that is, those who by virtue of some form of chemical dependency are no longer able to practice in a manner consistent with the accepted standards of professional conduct and who because of this dependency are either unable or unwilling to seek help themselves, often need a fellow practitioner to intervene on their behalf to notifying the State Committee of the existing problem so that the impaired practitioner may be brought to a recognition of his or her problem and begin to take positive steps towards their remedy.

Notification of discipline from other jurisdictions usually involves the licensing board of another state contacting the State Committee concerning an individual whose license has been disciplined in that state and who is likewise licensed in Missouri. Section 337.035.2(8), RSMo Supp. 1984, states:

“2. The department may cause a complaint to be filed with the administrative hearing commission as provided by chapter 621, RSMo, against any holder of any certificate of registration or authority, permit or license required by this chapter or any person who has failed to renew or has surrendered his certificate of registration or authority, permit or license for any one or any combination of the following causes:

(8) Disciplinary action against the holder of a license or other right to practice any profession regulated by this chapter granted by another state, territory, federal agency or country upon grounds for which revocation or suspension is authorized in this state;"

Once a complaint is received by the State Committee of Psychologists, the Committee will generally request that an investigation be conducted by an investigator assigned to the Committee to determine the accuracy of the allegations in the complaint and to obtain whatever additional information may be available. This investigatory report is then presented to the Committee, at which time a decision is made to either pursue the case or drop it. Clearly, if the independent investigation by the Committee's investigator shows that the original complaint is either spurious or groundless, no further action will be authorized.

If, however, the facts warrant further actions, the Committee may take one or two steps. If the Committee believes that the problems presented in the complaint may be best resolved by meeting with the individual practitioner to discuss the Committee's concerns and reaching an understanding with the individual, a meeting will be arranged, generally at the

next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee. This is the preferred method of handling complaints and the one most often used by the Committee.

If, however, the facts clearly indicate that the individual psychologist represents a threat to the safety of the people of the state of Missouri, or if after having met with the individual, no means of accommodation could be reached between the individual and the Committee that would satisfactorily resolve the problems raised in the complaint, the Committee may authorize the Attorney General's office to file a formal complaint with the Administrative Hearing Commission seeking a determination that cause exists to discipline the psychologist's license. This discipline may include probation, suspension, or revocation of the practitioner's license.

A trial-type hearing is then held before the Administrative Hearing Commission after which the Commission will render its decision. If cause is found by the Commission to exist to discipline the license, a separate hearing is then held before the State Committee of Psychologists to decide the appropriate degree of discipline. The practitioner is invited and encouraged to attend this hearing but is not required to do so.

Fortunately, there have been relatively few formal hearings before the Administrative Hearing Commission dealing with practicing psychologists. Although this may be attributed in part to the success that the Committee has had in dealing with issues on an informal level and reaching agreements with practitioners without having to go to the Administrative Hearing Commission for a formal decision, it is also an indication of the high standards of professionalism and competence in the psychology profession presently being practiced in the state of Missouri.

You Can Help!

Be sure to notify SCOP should you wish to make a complaint about a practicing psychologist or be aware of someone advertising as a psychologist who is not duly licensed. Send a copy of an advertisement, newsletter or other document to SCOP, P.O. Box 4, Jefferson City, MO 65102.

Not Current

The Missouri License law is specific about keeping your license current. Section 337.030 states in part

1. "Each psychologist licensed under the provisions of this chapter, who has not filed with the department a verified statement that he has retired from or terminated his practice of psychology in this state, shall register with the department on or before the registration renewal date . . . "
2. "Failure to provide the department with the information required for registration, or to pay the registration fee, shall after notification effect a revocation of the license after a period of sixty days from the registration renewal date. The license shall be restored if, within two years of the registration date, the applicant provides written application and the payment of the registration fee and a delinquency fee."

The following psychologists have not renewed their licenses nor paid the registration fee as of January, 1985.

John Adam	Carol Estrada	Hyman Meltzer	Michael Schwartz
David Armentrout	Morris Fishbein	Stanley Mize	Jerome Seeman
Carol Averill	Siebolt Frieswyk	Earl Moore	Michael Seidenberg
David Benson	Dennis Gardner	Wanda Morgan	Jack Seitzinger
Greg Berg	Sheldon Gardner	Jan Munson	Elizabeth Sukowicz
Elya Bresler	Thomas Guilmette	Roberta O-Carolan	Max Thompson
Leonard Brockway	James Hannum	Patricia Owen	Curt Toler
Freida Brown	William Harlow	Donald Petrovich	Dik Warren Twedt
Robert Burkham	Michele Henry	Gerald Prideaux	James Vanderplas
Ann Carberry	M. Herrick	Edward Purzycki	Jean Vanderplas
Jack Carmichael	Nancy Hillard	C. Steven Richards	George Weigly
Laurie Chassin	Steven Holley	Sally Robertson	Richard Williams
Ruth Clifford	William Jones	Michael Rooney	Artis Wood
Carole Collesano	Kenneth Kohutek	John Ryan	Allan Yater
Robert Costello	Barbara McCombs	James Schear	David Zemelman
Daniel Elash	James McKee	Donald Schubert	

NEWLY LICENSED PSYCHOLOGISTS

October 10, 1985 — Examination

Mark Altomari, Ph.D.
Samuel Blumberg, M.A.
Jefferies Caul, Ph.D.
Stephen Corey, Ph.D.
Gerald Cox, Psy.D.
Neal Deutch, Ph.D.
Joyce Everhart, Ph.D.
Susan Evers, M.A.
Sandra Gray, M.S.
Gwen Hendrix, M.S.
Marian Hjelmfelt, Ph.D.
John Kistorzy, M.A.
Jacqueline Langley, Ph.D.
Marla Liberman, Ph.D.
Mary Lipsmeyer, Ph.D.
Leslie Luchene, Ph.D.
Marc Maddox, Ph.D.
Robert McRoberts, Ph.D.
Rick Mehlman, Ph.D.
Evangeline Riebold, M.S.
Russell Searight, Ph.D.
Patricia Shaw, M.S.

Fradi Spilberg, Ph.D.
Avner Stern, Ph.D.
Lanelle Sutherland, Ed.D.
James Tichenor, Ph.D.
Robert Troutwine, Ph.D.
Barbara Wilper, M.A.

No. Taking Exam	34
No. Passing	28
National Exam Mean	136

1985 — Reciprocity

David Bailey, Ph.D.
Bruce Crosson, Ph.D.
Cooper Holmes, Ph.D.
Paul Van Wyk, Ph.D.

DATES TO REMEMBER

Next PES Psychology Exams

April 11, 1986
Jefferson City, MO

October 10 1986
Jefferson City, MO

Next SCOP Board Meetings

March 8 & 9, 1986
Clayton, MO

May 10 & 11, 1986
Kansas City, MO

July 12 & 13, 1986
Springfield, MO

State Committee of Psychologists
Post Office Box 4
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Phone: (314) 751-2334

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 237
Jefferson City, Mo. 65101